

REMARKS

As a preliminary matter, Applicants traverse the outstanding Office Action in its entirety as being nonresponsive. Section 707.07(f) of the MPEP places a burden upon the Examiner, when repeating a previous rejection, to first answer all of the meritorious arguments made by Applicants traversing that previous rejection. In the present case, however, the Examiner has not done so. Accordingly, the outstanding Office Action should be vacated, and full consideration given to all of Applicants' previous arguments, as discussed further below.

Claim 1-6, 8-16, and 18-21 again stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Nakajima (U.S. 5,654,735). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for the reasons of record, and as follows. A *prima facie* case of anticipation has not been established against the present invention.

The Examiner asserts that Nakajima reads upon the present invention because it can "simultaneously receive and write respective display signals," and because Nakajima also discloses a "driving circuit for sampling a plurality of video signals simultaneously and distributing the sampled video signals concurrently to a predetermined number of data lines."

Assuming, for the purposes of this discussion only, that the Examiner correctly characterizes the Nakajima reference, Nakajima still does not teach or suggest all of the previously argued features of the present invention.

For example, Applicants specifically pointed out to the Examiner, on page 9 of Amendment H, filed June 29, 2004, how the same newly-cited portions of Nakajima disclose

a simultaneous *sampling* of video signals that are concurrently distributed to data lines. (Col. 4, lines 22-25; col. 5, lines 31-51). Applicants also specifically pointed out to the Examiner how the described simultaneous sampling and concurrent distribution to data lines is not the same as what is claimed in the present invention, namely, the simultaneous supply of display signals from the signal lines to the data bus lines, and from the data bus lines to the signal lines. The Examiner has not responded to any of these arguments provided in Amendment H, all of which are therefore incorporated by reference herein.

The Examiner has therefore merely repeated the same teachings of Nakajima that Applicants have already meritoriously traversed, but without rebutting any of Applicants' arguments traversing these teachings. Nakajima illustrates in Fig. 1 that the horizontal driving circuit 13 samples the video signals SIG1, SIG2, SIG3 simultaneously *from the video driver 2*, and not from the data bus lines, which are part of the display panel 1, and shown to be separate from the video driver 2. In other words, the present invention does not merely claim a simultaneous receiving and writing of display signals, as implied by the Examiner on page 9 of the outstanding Office Action.

Instead, the present invention positively recites that display signals are simultaneously supplied from the signal lines to the data bus lines, and written to the signal lines from the data bus lines. The Examiner has not cited to any portion from Nakajima that teaches or suggests that the simultaneous receiving and writing of the display signals occurs both ways between the signal lines and the data bus lines, as in the present invention. Accordingly, the Examiner has not given full consideration to all of the recited language of

the claims of the present invention, and therefore a *prima facie* case of anticipation has not been established.

As discussed above, the cited portions of Nakajima, at most, only describe the simultaneous receipt of display signals from the video driver 2, and the one-way distribution of these sampled video signals to the data lines. Nothing in the cited portions of the reference teaches or suggests to also simultaneously receive display signals from the data bus lines to signal lines. In fact, as noted above, Nakajima appears to teach away from such an interpretation, by only teaching that the signal lines receive the display signals from the video driver 2, which does not include any of the data bus lines. Accordingly, for all of the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that a *prima facie* case of anticipation has not been established against the present invention based on the Nakajima reference, and therefore the repeated rejection by the Examiner is again respectfully traversed, and should be withdrawn.

Claims 7 and 17 also again stand rejected based on the Nakajima reference, but under Section 103(a). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection as well for at least the reasons of record, and those discussed above. As discussed above, Nakajima fails to disclose all of the recited features and limitations of the present invention, and even teaches away from such features as claimed. Any reference which teaches away from the claimed invention cannot form the basis of an obviousness rejection against the claimed invention. Accordingly, the Section 103 rejection of claims 7 and 17 based on Nakajima should also be withdrawn.

Additionally, Applicants further submit that the Examiner's citations to the Nakajima reference show nothing more than that already illustrated with respect to the conventional device shown in Figs. 1-3 of the present Application. The Specification to the present Application specifically describes, however, how such a conventional device has undesirable features, attributes, and/or results, and is thus incapable of realizing the advantageous results of the present invention, some of which are even listed with the technical Objectives.

In order to achieve one such objective, a data driver of the present invention, on a single edge of the LCD panel of the display device, is divided into a plurality of blocks, which results in a reduction of the number of display signal lines in each block, and therefore also a reduction of both the area for arranging the display signal lines and the cross-coupling capacitance while the display signals are supplied from the signal lines of each block to the data bus lines simultaneously. Nakajima, however, fails to teach, suggest, or otherwise consider such features and advantages as in the present invention. Advantages realized by the claimed invention, but not by the prior art, are also to be considered by the Examiner in determining the appropriateness of a rejection based upon obviousness. Because Nakajima fails to achieve these advantages of the present invention though, Applicants further submit that the Section 103 rejection should be withdrawn for at least these additional reasons.

For all of the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that this Application, including claims 1-21, is in condition for allowance, which is respectfully requested. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney if a further interview would help expedite prosecution.

Respectfully submitted,

GREER, BURNS & CRAIN, LTD.

By



Josh C. Snider

Registration No. 47,954

Customer No. 24978

March 24, 2005

300 South Wacker Drive
Suite 2500
Chicago, Illinois 60606
Telephone: (312) 360-0080
Facsimile: (312) 360-9315

P:\DOCS\0941\63012\838841.DOC